

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MICHAEL PIRCIO, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-1550-CDS-NJK
**ORDER GRANTING
STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME
TO FILE DEFENDANT’S
RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT
(FIFTH REQUEST)**

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1, Plaintiff Michael Pircio and Defendant MGM Resorts International (“MGM”) (collectively, the “Parties”) respectfully stipulate MGM’s time to respond to the Complaint be extended from the current deadline of March 11, 2024 to and including April 10, 2024. This is the fifth stipulation for an extension of time to file MGM’s responsive pleading. The court previously granted an extension on January 9, 2024. ECF No. 21.

Good cause exists to enlarge the time for MGM to respond to the Complaint. There are currently thirteen other related actions filed against MGM pending in this District (the “Related Actions”). *See Kirwan v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01481; *Owens v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01480; *Lackey v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01549; *Zussman v. Vici Properties Inc., et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-01537; *Terezo v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01577; *Rundell v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01698; *Bezack v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01719; *Albrigo v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-1981; *Zari v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01777; *Manson v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-01826; *Sloan v. Vici Properties Inc., et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-02042; *Mejia v. MGM Resorts, Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-00081; *Righetti v. MGM Resorts Int’l*, No. 2:23-cv-2064.

On December 6 and December 20, 2023, plaintiffs’ counsel in six consolidated putative class actions brought against MGM by individuals who allege their PII was compromised as a result of a cybersecurity incident involving MGM in 2019 (the “2019 Actions”) filed Notices of Related Cases Pursuant to District of Nevada Local Rule 42.1, notifying the Court that the Related Actions are related to the 2019 Actions. *In re: MGM Resorts Int’l Data Breach Litig.*, No. 2:20-CV-00376-GMN-NJK, ECF Nos. 186, 188. Plaintiffs in this action have opposed this effort because the 2019 Actions involved a different threat actor and different data. No order has issued on the notices filed by the plaintiffs in the 2019 Actions, and MGM has not responded to any other Complaint in the Related Actions.

The parties in the Related Actions are discussing this development in addition to the consolidation of the Related Actions. The parties in the Related Actions have also engaged

1 in preliminary information exchange that may avoid the need for certain motion practice,
2 which would conserve judicial resources. As such, additional time is required to permit time
3 to meet and confer with the various parties to the Related Actions.

4 The Parties' request is made in good faith to enable the parties to finalize the joint
5 motion for consolidation and conserve judicial and party resources. Moreover, this case is
6 in its infancy, and this request will not prejudice any party.

7 **WHEREAS** the Parties respectfully request that MGM shall have until April 10,
8 2024, to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint.

9 Dated: March 7, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

10 By: /s/ George Haines
George Haines
Gerardo Avalos
11 **FREEDOM LAW FIRM, LLC**
8985 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 100
12 Las Vegas, NV 89123
13 ghaines@freedomlegalteam.com

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class*

15 By: /s/ Todd L. Bice
Todd L. Bice
16 **PISANELLI BICE, PLLC**
400 S. 7th Street Suite 300
17 Las Vegas, NV 89101
18 tlb@pisanellibice.com

19 Angela C. Agrusa
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 Avenue of the Stars
20 Suite 400 North Tower
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4735
21 Angela.agrusa@us.dlapiper.com

22 *Attorneys for Defendant*
23 *MGM Resorts International*

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

25 
26 THE HONORABLE NANCY J. KOPPE
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28 DATED: March 8, 2024